



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/671,738	09/29/2003	Masahiro Ishiyama	03180.0335	6750
22852	7590	06/22/2010	EXAMINER	
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413				ALI, FARHAD
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2446				
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/22/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/671,738	ISHIYAMA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	FARHAD ALI	2446

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 03 June 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 - b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 - (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: _____.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
13. Other: _____.

/Jeffrey Pwu/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2446

/Farhad Ali/
Examiner, Art Unit 2446

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant has argued that Ford "fails to even mention providing "the prefix corresponding to the interface identification information.., without the interface identification information," as recited in claim 1. In fact, Ford's teaching of the generated IP address requires the IP address containing "a format indication portion, a network identifying portion, and a host identifying portion," which is contrary to the recited features in claim 1" (See Arguments Page 4 2nd paragraph).

The examiner respectfully disagrees and notes that Ford teaches in Column 8 lines 11-20 "Yet another way of consistently determining or obtaining the network identifying portion of an IP address is to use a network protocol for obtaining the information for the portion directly or indirectly from other devices attached to the network. Those skilled in the art will also appreciate that other mechanisms may also exist that would allow consistent and predictable generation of the same network identifying portion of an IP address that would work with the present invention are possible". The examiner asserts that Ford teaches the claimed limitation.

In regards to "Further, Ford is completely silent regarding any node that is not connected to the network knows a different prefix of the prescribed node, as also required by claim 1" (See Arguments Page 4 3rd paragraph), the examiner notes that Ahmed is cited for teaching these limitations. The applicant has also argued that "Ahmed's teaching of mobility management using HLRNLR requires attachment to the mobile network, and thus such teaching cannot suggest any node that is not connected to the network knows a different prefix of the prescribed node, as also required by claim 1" (See Arguments Page 5 1st paragraph).

The examiner respectfully disagrees and notes that Ahmed teaches in column 13 lines 35-45 "Also, a network node itself may move out of range, losing all mobiles attached to it. In this case, the mobiles will try to connect with the neighboring nodes. Depending on the availability, some mobiles may be able to connect to the neighboring nodes. To minimize the number of location update messages, each neighboring node sends location update messages to the HLRs of all the newly joined mobiles (via the internode network 108)". The examiner asserts that Ahmed teaches the claimed limitation.